

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of the application are respectfully requested in view of the amendments and remarks herewith, which place the application into condition for allowance. The present amendment is being made to facilitate prosecution of the application.

**I. STATUS OF THE CLAIMS AND FORMAL MATTERS**

Claims 35-66 are pending in this application. Claims 35 and 51 are independent. Claims 1-34 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer of subject matter. It is submitted that these claims, as originally presented, were in full compliance with the requirements 35 U.S.C. §112. No new matter has been introduced by this amendment. Support for this amendment is provided throughout the Specification. Changes to claims are not made for the purpose of patentability within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §101, §102, §103, or §112. Rather, these changes are made simply for clarification and to round out the scope of protection to which the Applicants are entitled.

**II. OBJECTIONS TO THE SPECIFICATION**

The Office Action objected to the title. The title is hereby amended, without prejudice, from “TRANSLATING METHOD AND TRANSLATING DEVICE” to “TRANSLATING TARGET LANGUAGE WITH INPUT SELECTION.”

The Office Action also indicated an objection to the disclosure. The Specification is hereby amended to correct minor typographical and grammatical errors. Applicants submit that this amendment obviates this objection.

### **III. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §112**

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 9-13, 15, 21-23, 26, 27, 31, and 32 were objected to under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being allegedly indefinite. These claims are hereby canceled, obviating the rejection.

### **IV. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102(b)**

Claims 1-7, 9, 12, 14, 18-24, 26, and 31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,393,388 to Franz et al. Claims 1-7, 9, 12, 14, 18-24, 26, and 31 are hereby canceled, obviating the rejection.<sup>1</sup>

### **V. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

Claims 8, 16-17, 28, 31, 33, and 34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,393,388 to Franz et al. as applied to claims 1 and 18 in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,854,977 to Sukeda et al.

Claims 29 and 30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,393,388 to Franz et al. in view of in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,854,977 to Sukeda et al. and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 4,730,270 to Okajima et al.

Claims 10 and 27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,393,388 to Franz et al.

---

<sup>1</sup> Applicants note that U.S. Patent No. 6,393,388 was issued May 21, 2002, which was after the filing date of the present application. Thus, Applicants assume the Office Action intended the rejection to be based on 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

Claims 13, 15, 31, and 32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,393,388 to Franz et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,730,270 to Okajima et al.

Claims 8, 10, 13, 15-17, and 27- 34 are hereby canceled, obviating the rejection. Further more, Applicants note that U.S. Patent No. 6,393,388 to Franz was filed after November 29, 2000 and is commonly assigned to the assignee of the present application. Therefore, Applicants submit this patent is not available as prior art because 35 U.S.C. §103(c) applies.

## VI. RESPONSE TO 35 U.S.C. §102 REJECTIONS

New Claim 35 recites, *inter alia*:

“...**generating one or more translation candidates** as a function of the translation information and the relationship between the source language sentence data and the translation information; and **determining the applicability of each translation candidate** to the source language sentence data.” (Emphasis Added)

As understood by Applicants, U.S. Patent No. 6,393,388 to Franz et al. (hereinafter, merely “Franz”) relates to an example based translation method that employs multi-stage syntax dividing.

Applicants submit that nothing has been found in Franz that discloses or suggests the above-identified features of claim 35. Therefore, new claim 35 is patentable

For reasons similar to those described above, new claim 51 is believed to be patentable.

## VII. DEPENDENT CLAIMS

The other claims in this application are each dependent from one of the independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed patentable for at least the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

### CONCLUSION

In the event the Examiner disagrees with any of statements appearing above with respect to the disclosure in the cited references, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner specifically indicate the portion, or portions, of the reference , or references, providing the basis for a contrary view.

Please charge any additional fees that may be needed, and credit any overpayment, to our Deposit Account No. 50-0320.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is believed that all of the claims in this application are patentable and Applicants respectfully request early passage to issue of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,  
FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP  
Attorneys for Applicants

By Thomas F. Presson  
Thomas F. Presson  
Reg. No. 41,442  
(212) 588-0800